

29. Need for a Jenmi Member in the Legislative Council.

Mr. Akkiran Maheswaran Bhattathiri (Member, Jenmi, Quilon Division) said that most of the Jenmis of the State were Malayala Brahmins, a community that was admittedly backward in education, especially English education. The Report and the Draft Bill submitted by the Members of the Jenmi Kudiyan Committee were pending before the Government. It was essential that, at the time the Bill was taken for consideration in the Council, there should be one Jenmi Member in the Council to represent the interests of the Jenmis. The Member, therefore, prayed that a Jenmi might be appointed to the Council, or that, if that was not feasible, at least a duly qualified person nominated by the Jenmis might be appointed as a Member.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

30. Need for an Ezhava Member in the Legislative Council.

Mr. K. Padmanabha Channar (Member, Nominated) said that the Ezhava community numbered more than 5 lakhs, that a Bill relating to the community would be soon coming before the Legislative Council and that there were many persons in the community qualified to become members of the Council. He, therefore, prayed that an Ezhava Member might be appointed to the Legislative Council.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

31. Some criticisms on the Report of the Jenmi Kudiyan Committee and the annexed Draft Bill.

Dewan.—Before the Member proceeds to his subject, I would just mention that the Report of the Jenmi-Kudiyan Committee and the Draft Bill have been translated into Malayalam and published in the Gazette. The Government have just passed orders—and the same will appear in the next Gazette—to the effect that the period of six months allowed for submitting the views of the public on the recommendations of the Committee will count from the date of publication of the Malayalam translation of the Report and the Bill in the Gazette. The Report is a long one and any suggestions on the Report or the Bill, if made to the Government, will be duly considered before the Bill is taken up in the Legislative Council. It may not be practicable to discuss all the suggestions in the Assembly.

Mr. Trivikramar Vasudevar (Member, Jenmi, Padmanabhapuram Division) said that he was not going to speak at length on the merits of the several recommendations in the Report and that he only wished to represent certain grievances of his community in regard to the doings of the Jenmi-Kudiyan Committee. When it was decided to appoint such a Committee, his community had certain misgivings and fears and he regretted to have to say that those misgivings and fears were now fully justified by the Report of the Committee. He had not to say anything against the constitution of the Committee, though he was not prepared to hold that it was the best that could be thought of. It was regrettable that such a serious evil should have befallen the community at the hands of a Committee presided over by a District Judge. If a Judge of the High Court or any one else who did not own any landed properties in the State had been appointed as the President, such a one-sided Report would not have issued as the result of the labours of the Committee. The Draft Bill was worded with avowed sympathy, nay, even deliberate partiality, for the *Kudiyans*, and the interests of the Jenmis were ignored. The Member did not understand the object of narrating in detail, on the alleged authority of certain records, that the Namburi community had a low origin (*Vide* pages 22-74 of the translation of the Report). The relevancy of that portion of the Report to the points directly referred to the Committee by the Government was not apparent. Scrupulous care had been taken to search for and collect all records which could in any way go against the community and they were given a place in the Report, though they had no connection with the points at issue. The Report had cast a lasting slur on the community generally, which could not be easily wiped off. The result was that the uncalled-for remarks made in the Report lowered the community in the estimation of others.

The main object of the enquiry was to devise such measures as would ensure to the Jenmis a speedy method of recovering their *michavaram* and other dues, but the Bill did not seek to afford any adequate relief in that direction. The community, therefore, had begun to feel whether they would not have been better in their position such as it was before the creation of the Committee. In dealing with the above said portion of the Report, the Committee had merely wasted time and public money with no good either to the people or to the Government.

Then again, the enquiries conducted by the Committee in the different places were not fair to the Jenmis. In some cases, statements were extorted from witnesses by coercion and undue influence. The Report did not contain anything in favour of the Jenmis. Even the behaviour of the Committee towards the Jenmi witnesses was not as it ought to have been. The Report also contained a stigma on the judicial act of the one Nambudiri judge in Travancore who, at one time, happened to preside over the High Court. The Member said that the Government should take notice of the waste of time entailed in the preparation of such a Report. It was with a view to minimise litigation between Jenmis and Kudiyaans that a revised Bill was wished for. The Bill did not, however, afford a satisfactory solution of that question. It would be more appropriate to designate the Bill as the *Kanapattom* Bill. In conclusion, he requested that the Government should make careful investigation as to the manner in which the Committee conducted their enquiries and examination of witnesses, and find out a simple remedy for the redress of the long-standing grievances of the community.

Dewan's reply.—The Government will gladly consider the objections and suggestions which the Jenmis and Kudiyaans may have to make in regard to the Draft Bill, and any modifications that may be found necessary will be made therein; and the Bill, in the form in which it is to be introduced into the Legislative Council, will again be published in the Gazette prior to its introduction.

In regard to what the Member has said about the Report, I would at once say that the opinions contained in the Report are *not* the opinions of the Government. What was published in the Gazette is the Report of the Committee and it must be taken to represent the individual opinions of the President or the Members of the Committee over whose signature the Report or any portion of it has appeared. The facts stated in the Report are not the views of the Government, nor will they bind the Government in any way. I cannot say that I have critically gone through the entire Report, as the necessity for a careful study of the details has not yet arisen. That will be done when the Draft Bill, with the suggestions of the public, is taken up for consideration. In terms of what the Member said just now about certain objectionable portions in the Report, some Namburi gentlemen have also spoken to me personally. A few petitions have also been received on the same subject from certain members of the community. If, as is urged, the Report in any portion contains statements that go to affect the name and fame of either the Jenmis or the Kudiyaans, the Government do not share the Committee's views in that respect. So far as the Government are concerned, they will consider and act on those portions of the Report only which have any connection with the modifications, which have been proposed or are necessary in the present law governing the relations between the Jenmis and the Kudiyaans.

32. Desirability of expunging Chapter I from the Report of the Jenmi Kudiyaan Committee.

Mr. Akkiran Maheswaran Bhattathiri (Member, Jenmi, Quilon Division) said that he completely agreed in the views expressed by the previous speaker on the undesirability of inserting certain statements in the Report, which were derogatory to the Jenmis as a class. The Member pointed out that the opinion expressed by the Committee on the origin, etc., of Jenmis was not based on any evidence collected in the course of the Committee's enquiries and that the Report and the Draft Bill appeared to be highly injurious to the reputation of the Jenmis. He, therefore, prayed that the Government might be pleased to examine, peruse and consider very carefully the whole records connected with the question and that, if it